

Serial No.: 10/073,404  
Filed: February 11, 2002

Group Art Unit: 2826  
Examiner: V. Mandala

### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 are currently pending in this application. By virtue of this amendment claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Fujihira et al.

The Examiner determined that Fujihira et al. disclose a power MOSFET device wherein the N<sup>+</sup> doped well is spaced apart from and located above the P<sup>+</sup> well.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 to require that the N<sup>+</sup> well and the P<sup>+</sup> well are separated by at least a portion of the P<sup>+</sup> well. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, for example at pages 8-9 and in Figures 2(a) through 2(j).

Applicant's invention is concerned with increasing the avalanche-breakdown current endurance of the power MOSFET device. Applicants have discovered that the current endurance of the device can be increased when the source contact region of the N<sup>+</sup> well and that of the P<sup>+</sup> well are not at the same level, i.e., are separated by at least a portion of the P<sup>+</sup> well.

Fujihira et al. do not teach or fairly suggest a power MOSFET device wherein the N<sup>+</sup> well and the P<sup>+</sup> well are separated by at least a portion of the P<sup>+</sup> well. As seen in Figure 1, the N<sup>+</sup> well and the P<sup>+</sup> well of Fujihira et al. are adjacent to each other and are not separated by at least a portion of the P<sup>+</sup> well, as required by Applicant's amended

Serial No.: 10/073,404  
Filed: February 11, 2002

Group Art Unit: 2826  
Examiner: V. Mandala

claims. Therefore, Fujihira et al. do not describe or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 as being anticipated by Fujihira et al. is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is requested. Applicants believe that claims 1 and 3 are now in condition for allowance and an indication of allowability and an early Notice of Allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If Examiner feels that a telephonic interview would be helpful, he is requested to call the undersigned at (203) 575-2629.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Arthur G. Schaier  
Arthur G. Schaier, Reg. 37,715  
Carmody & Torrance LLP  
50 Leavenworth Street  
P.O. Box 1110  
Waterbury, CT 06721-1110  
(203) 575-2629

**OFFICIAL**

**FAX RECEIVED**

**AUG 12 2003**

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**